IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

| Shaheen Cabbagestalk, |) |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Petitioner, |) C. A. No. 5:14-3771-RMG |
| Vs. |)) |
| Warden J. McFadden, |))) ORDER |
| Respondent. |) |
| |)) |

This matter comes before the Court on Petitioner's motions for reconsideration of two orders of this Court. (Dkt. Nos. 160, 165). Both of these motions for reconsideration were filed after the Court had entered an order granting summary judgment to Respondent (Dkt. No. 128) and Petitioner had filed a notice of appeal to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals (Dkt. No. 135). The first motion to reconsider (Dkt. No. 160) sought reconsideration of the Court's denial of Petitioner's motion for a change of venue based on mootness because summary judgment had already been granted in the case. (Dkt. No. 157). The second motion to reconsider (Dkt. No. 165) related to the Court's grant of summary judgment and was filed after the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals entered its mandate dismissing Petitioner's appeal from this Court's grant of summary judgment. (Dkt. No. 164). Dkt. No. 165 represents the second request by Petitioner to reconsider the grant of summary judgment, with the Court denying the first request for reconsideration on July 13, 2015. (Dkt. No. 133).

Neither motion sets forth any basis for reconsideration under the standards of Fed. R. Civ.

P. 59(e), which must involve a change in controlling law, new evidence not previously available, or correction of a clear error of law or manifest injustice. *Hill v. Braxton*, 277 F.3d 701, 708 (4th Cir. 2002). Therefore, Petitioner's motions for reconsideration (Dkt. Nos. 160, 165) are **DENIED**. The Clerk is directed not to accept for filing any future motions for reconsideration in this case without special leave of court.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

Richard Mark Gergel

United States District Judge

February <u>1</u>, 2016 Charleston, South Carolina